

REMARKS

These remarks and the accompanying amendments are responsive to the Office Action mailed April 24, 2005 (hereinafter referred to as "the Office Action"). Claims 1-33 were pending at the time of the last examination. By this amendment, Claims 1, 2, 3, 9, 10, 17, 21, 24, 27, 30, and 31 are amended. Reconsideration and allowance for the above-identified application are now respectfully requested in light of these remarks and the accompanying amendments

Applicants and Applicant's attorney would first like to express appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the recent interview held on May 19, 2005. Applicant's attorney found the suggestions discussed during the interview to be very helpful and has endeavored to implement the suggestions in the amended claims.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Page 2 of the Office Action rejects Claims 1-19 and 21-33 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,915,001 to *Uppaluru* ("*Uppaluru*"). The pending Claims are directed towards embodiments for allowing a user to control how information is presented to the user through use of an audio interface. For example, the embodiments disclose a user-defined map that parses and displays Internet documents for mapping. The user selects a region of the Internet document to be mapped and designates a selected region containing links and text. The selected region may be named. The user access a voice browser over the telephone to listen to an audio representation of Internet page document based on the user-defined map. However, only those text and links that are defined in the user-defined map based on a comparison of between the user-defined map and the Internet document are retrieved by the audio interface.

The Office Action of April 25, 2005 states that *Uppaluru* discloses every element of Claim 1 by reciting the following: receiving a Voice Web Page (Internet document) in response to user request (first user input) received from a computing system, displaying the Internet document to a user, displaying the Internet document, selecting a Personal Home Page (a region) of the Internet document, the region including at least one of text and links, receiving a Personal Administrative Assistant Page (a name) from a user that associates the selected region of the Internet document with the administrative services (a category) in the user-defined map, and maps the administrative services (region) to the user-defined map as the category in the a menu of service pages (categories), the category corresponding to the selected region. The Office Action points to Figure 3 and various lines of the *Uppaluru* patent to show how *Uppaluru* allegedly anticipates all of the elements of Claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that pending Claim 1 is not anticipated by the cited *Uppaluru* reference for at least the reason that *Uppaluru* does not disclose each and every element of pending Claim 1. As was suggested and discussed during the interview, pending Claim 1 has been amended to include the limitation of comparing the user-defined map with the retrieved Internet document to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface. In other words, the user-defined map determines which of the text and links of the Internet document will be presented to the user over the audio interface.

Uppaluru, however, does not teach or suggest comparing a user-defined map with a retrieved Internet document in order to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface. Accordingly, because *Uppaluru* does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1, *Uppaluru* does not anticipate Claim 1.

Independent Claims 17, 24 and 30 each have also been amended to include the limitation of comparing the user-defined map with the Internet document to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface as discussed above with regard to Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 17, 24 and 30 are also not anticipated by *Uppaluru* for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Claim 1.

Claims 2-16, 18-19, and 21-33 variously depend from Claims 1, 17, 24 and 30; and are therefore, patentably distinguishable over the cited *Uppaluru* reference for at least those reasons stated above with regards to Claim 1.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

On page 7 of the Office Action, Claims 1-19 and 21-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,884,262 to *Wise et al.* ("*Wise*"). The Examiner points to Figures 1-3 and various lines in the patent to allege that *Wise* discloses every element of pending Claim 1 and is therefore obvious. As discussed above, pending Claim 1 has been amended, based on the discussion held during the interview, to include the limitation of comparing the user-defined map with the retrieved Internet document to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface. *Wise* does not teach or suggest comparing a user-defined map with a retrieved Internet document in order to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface. Accordingly, because *Wise* does not disclose each and every element of Claim 1, *Wise* does not render pending Claim 1 unpatentable.

Independent Claims 17, 24 and 30 each have also been amended to include comparing the user-defined map with the Internet document to define the portions of the Internet document that are to be presented to the user over the audio interface. as discussed above with regard to

Claim 1. Accordingly, Claims 17, 24 and 30 are not rendered unpatentable by *Wise* for at least those reasons stated above with regard to Claim 1.

Claims 2-16, 18-19, and 21-33 variously depend from Claims 1, 17, 24 and 30; and are therefore, patentably distinguishable over the cited *Wise* reference for at least those reasons stated above with regards to Claim 1.

On page 11 of the Office Action, Claim 20 is allegedly unpatentable over *Uppaluru* in light of U.S. Patent No. 6,459,774 to *Ball et al.* ("*Ball*"). However, Claim 20 depends from Claim 17, which as amended is now patentable over *Uppaluru* for those reasons stated above. Accordingly, Claim 20 is now patentable over *Uppaluru* and *Ball*.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully note that the discussion herein should not be construed to constitute an exhaustive enumeration of the distinctions between the claims of the present application and the references cited by the Examiner. Instead, such distinctions are presented solely by way of example. Consistent with the foregoing, the discussion herein is not intended, and should not be construed, to prejudice or foreclose future consideration, by the Applicants, of additional or alternative distinctions between the claims of the present application and the references cited by the Examiner.

Applicants notes further that the arguments and/or amendments presented herein have been made merely to clarify the claimed invention from elements purported by the Examiner to be disclosed by the cited prior art references. Such arguments and/or amendments should not, however, be construed as an acquiescence on the part of the Applicants as to the purported teachings or prior art status of any of the cited references, nor as to any characterization of the cited references advanced by the Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants reserve the right to

challenge the purported teaching and prior art status of any and all of the cited references at any appropriate time.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner remove the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 103(a) rejections. Applicants and Applicants' attorney believe that they have addressed all of the issues raised by the Examiner in the Office Action and have put Claims 1-33 in a condition of allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated this 22 day of July, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,



R. Burns Israelson
Registration No. 42,685
Attorney for Applicant
Customer No. 022913

SKJ:kjn
KJN0000001414V001